

REMARKS

Claims In the above referenced Office Action, the Examiner divided the claims into the following groups:

Group I, Claims 1-4, drawn to a method for sizing an aircraft system;

Group II, Claims 29, 31-38, 41-44, 47-50, drawn to an aircraft system.

Upon election of group I or II, the Examiner required an election from the following species:

- a. Design conditions
- b. Operating conditions

Upon election of species a or b, the Examiner required an election from the following species:

- c. wherein a leading edge device chord length is equal to the smallest leading edge device chord length required to provide a local maximum lift coefficient
- d. wherein a leading edge device chord length at each spanwise location is not equal to the smallest leading edge device chord length to provide a local maximum lift coefficient.

Upon election of species a or b, the Examiner also required an election of various alternative conditions (e.g., high subsonic flight speed condition, transonic cruise condition, landing condition, maneuvering flight condition, etc.)

Upon election of species a or b, the Examiner further required an election from the following species:

- e. Flight plan
- f. Velocity
- g. Acceleration

h. Rates (yaw rate)

Upon election of species a or b, the Examiner still further required an election from the following species:

i. Aircraft weight

j. Carriage of one store

k. Carriage of more than one stores

l. Aircraft structural arrangements

m. Moments of inertia created by internal loading

n. Dynamic movement of various control surfaces

o. Aircraft Configuration

In response, the applicant elects Group II without traverse. Non-elected claims 1-4 and withdrawn dependent claim 5 have been cancelled without prejudice to pursuing these claims in a continuation, divisional, continuation-in-part or other application. Additionally, claims 41 and 47 have been amended to recite "design condition." Claims 30, 40, and 46 were withdrawn in response to a previous Restriction Requirement. These claims were withdrawn without prejudice to consideration of these claims upon allowance of a generic claim.


The applicant also elects species: (a) design conditions; (c) wherein a leading edge device chord length is equal to the smallest leading edge device chord length required to provide a local maximum lift coefficient; (f) Velocity; and (o) aircraft configuration. Additionally, with respect to selecting various alternative conditions, the applicant elects low speed conditions. The foregoing election is made with the understanding that the Examiner and the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office are now bound to the finding of non-obviousness between each of the species.

Upon allowance of the generic claims, applicant requests consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent from or which otherwise include all the limitations of the allowed generic claims. Additionally, the applicant does not concur with the Examiner's current suggestion that there are no generic claims.

No fees are believed due with this communication. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized and requested to charge any deficiency in fees herein to Deposit Account No. 50-0665.

Respectfully submitted,
Perkins Coie LLP

Date: June 16, 2005



Tim R. Seeley
Registration No. 53,575

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 25096
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000